

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

COMMISSIONER LOKENTED	110
P.O. Box 1450	
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450	
www.usnto.gov	

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO		
10/656,003	09/05/2003	Douglas G. Pullman	5102.488US01	5102.488US01 7516		
23552	7590 06/28/2004		EXAMINER			
MERCHANT & GOULD PC P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903		GOULD PC		POPOVICS, ROBERT J		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			1724	-		
			DATE MAILED: 06/28/2004	1		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				14/6			
2		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
.		10/656,003	PULLMAN				
Office Actio	n Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Robert J. Popovics	1724				
The MAILING DA Period for Reply	TE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	ldress			
A SHORTENED STATUTHE MAILING DATE OF Extensions of time may be available after SIX (6) MONTHS from the lift he period for reply specified If NO period for reply is specified. Failure to reply within the set of	F THIS COMMUNICATION. lable under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: mailing date of this communication. above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply dd above, the maximum statutory period v extended period for reply will, by statute el later than three months after the mailing	Y IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE date of this communication, even if timely filed	nely filed s will be considered time the mailing date of this o D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
<u> </u>	mmunication(a) filed on 22 to	2004					
·	mmunication(s) filed on <u>22 Ja</u>	action is non-final.					
, 	•		accution as to the	a marita ia			
,		nce except for formal matters, pro Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45		s mems is			
ciosed in accorda	nice with the practice under £	x parte Quayle, 1955 C.D. 11, 40	J3 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/a	☑ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above of	claim(s) is/are withdrav	vn from consideration.					
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>19 and 2</u>	<u>0</u> is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/a	Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is	/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) a	e subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Application Papers							
9) The specification is	s objected to by the Examine	r.					
10) The drawing(s) file	☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawi	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
		aminer. Note the attached Office					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119						
-		priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	\ (d) or (f)				
∕ -	*	priority under 33 0.3.C. § 119(a))-(u) or (r).				
· ·	· ·-						
	•	s have been received in Applicati	on No				
	•	rity documents have been receive		Stane			
<u> </u>	from the International Bureau	•	ou in this Huttoria.	Olago			
		of the certified copies not receive	ed.				
		•					
Attachment(s)		_					
1) Notice of References Cited		4) Interview Summary					
·	tent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P		O-152)			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date		6) Other:		•			

Art Unit: 1724

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-18 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,533,946 in view of Willis (US 5,814,230). Claims 1-18 essentially differ from claims 1-9 of '946 by specifying "A method for treating fluid body waste material." Willis discloses a similar apparatus for separating solids from liquids. While the disclosure principally discusses the treating of drilling mud with disclosed apparatus, Willis also teaches that his apparatus may be used in sewage treatment (see col. 16, lines 30-65). In view of the disclosure of Willis, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to employ the apparatus of claims 1-9 of '945 to treat sewage. In doing so, the method recited in claims 1-18 is rendered obvious.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Robert

J. Popovics at telephone number (571) 272-1164.

Robert James Popovics Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1724